

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 5, 2006.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed October 5, 2006, Claims 1-62 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 18 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-38 of prior U.S. Publication No. 2005/0177580 (U.S. Patent Application No. 10/777,289). Claims 1-62 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hilbert et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088570, hereinafter Hilbert '570) in view of Godlin, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0161860, hereinafter Godlin) and further in view of Zhang, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,478, hereinafter Zhang).

### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment**

The present Response amends Claims 18 and 24, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-62. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

### **III. Statement of Common Ownership**

The present Application No. 10/790,402 and the cited U.S. Publication No. 2005/0177580 (Application No. 10/777,289) were, at the time the invention of Application 10/790,402 was made, commonly owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd.

#### **IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Office Action mailed October 5, 2006, Claims 18 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the limitation “a hyperlink which is difficult to produce” was argued to render the claim indefinite.

The present Response hereby amends Claims 18 and 24 so as to more clearly define the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submit that as amended, Claims 18 and 24 now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **V. Double Patenting**

In the Office Action mailed October 5, 2006, Claims 1-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-38 of prior U.S. Publication No. 2005/0177580 (U.S. Patent Application No. 10/777,289).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-38 of the cited prior U.S. Publication No. 2005/0177580 have been amended since the issuing of the present Office Action. As such, Claims 1-62 of the present Application no longer claim the same invention as that of amended claims 1-38 of the cited prior U.S. Publication No. 2005/0177580. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Double Patenting rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is no longer proper and should be withdrawn.

#### **VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed October 5, 2006, Claims 1-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hilbert et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088570, hereinafter Hilbert '570) in view of Godlin, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0161860, hereinafter Godlin) and further in view of Zhang, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,478, hereinafter Zhang).

Applicants submit herewith (see section III above) a Statement of Common Ownership, stating that the present Application 10/790,402 and Publication No. 2003/0088570 (Application No. 09/985,599) were, at the time the invention of Application 10/790,402 was made, commonly owned by Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd., or were subject to an obligation of assignment to Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd.

As such, Applicant requests that the Hilbert '570 reference (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088570) be disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(c).

Applicant respectfully submits that disqualification of the Hilbert '570 reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) renders moot the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicant also respectfully submits that claims 1-62 are now allowable over the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is requested.

**VII. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 4, 2007

By: /Justas Geringson/

Justas Geringson  
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Fax: (415) 362-2928